

**Week 2 Assignment: Mining for Data**

**Overview**

In this week’s lecture, we discussed the Texas accountability system and the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) as a school improvement tool in relation to No Child Left Behind. This week, you will perform Step 2 of the comprehensive needs assessment, which you will use later to develop a campus action plan.

In this assignment, you will explore the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data, locate reports that are critical to your campus improvement team, and compare your selected campus’ performance to AEIS standards. Your goal in completing this data analysis is to determine areas of strength and weakness and identify patterns and trends at your selected campus.

**Rubric**

Use the following rubric to guide your work.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tasks** | **Accomplished** | **Proficient** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unacceptable** |
| **Week 2 Assignment: Mining for Data (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.3 s-ii;2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)** | | | | |
| **Part 1: Campus Report Summary** | Conducts detailed comparison of scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(10 points)** | Compares scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(8 points)** | Does not compare scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(7 points)** | Does not summarize Campus Report.  **(0 points)** |
| **Part 2: Campus Group and CI Report Summary** | Conducts detailed comparison of scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(10 points)** | Compares scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(8 points)** | Does not compare scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary.  **(7 points)** | Does not turn in this portion of assignment.  **(0 points)** |
| **Part 3: Multi-Year History Report Summary** | Successfully notes trends and/or patterns in campus AEIS data.  **(10 points)** | Notes one trend and/or pattern in campus AEIS data.  **(8 points)** | Does not note trends and/or patterns in campus AEIS data.  **(7 points)** | Does not turn in this portion of assignment.  **(0 points)** |
| **Part 4: AEIS Chart Completion** | Completes all applicable data in three AEIS Comparison Charts.  **(10 points)** | Completes all applicable data in two AEIS Comparison Charts.  **(8 points)** | Completes all applicable data in one AEIS Comparison Chart.  **(7 points)** | Does not turn in this portion of assignment.  **(0 points)** |
| **Part 5: Area of Strength** | Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness from AEIS data, and explains choices with detailed elaboration.  **(10 points)** | Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness from AEIS data, and explains choices with some elaboration.  **(8 points)** | Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness with no elaboration  **(7 points)** | Does not turn in this portion of assignment.  **(0 points)** |
| **Mechanics** | Few errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.  **(5 points)** |  |  | Multiple errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation.  Responses lack clarity and depth.  **(0 points)** |

**Part 1: Campus Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

A critical skill for an instructional leader is the ability to use data-based decision making. You will practice this skill in this Application assignment as you collect data in preparation for creating an action plan for school improvement. In this section, you will select a school—ideally one in which you work—and review its AEIS data.

Directions

1. Navigate to [*http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis*](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis). On the left side of the Web page, select the most current AEIS data.
2. When the next screen appears, click “Campus Report” on the left.
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a campus AEIS Report. Then click continue.
4. Print out the Campus Report.
5. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format. Study Section I and Section II by row, title, and column heading so that you will know where to locate specific information.
   * Look for increases and decreases in the two-year comparison provided
   * Review each indicator on the report, and compare your campus performance on each indicator to the standards for Unacceptable, Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary ratings
6. Summarize your Campus Report findings in the workspace below.

Campus Report Summary Workspace

|  |
| --- |
| Sundown’s accountability rating for the 2008-09 school year was Exemplary. Commended Performance increased in Science by 3% to97%, Social Studies and Reading/ELA stayed the same at 99% and Mathematics decrease 2% to 96% . In 2008-09 we had a 100% participation rate for grades 3-11, which remained the same from the previous year. Progress of Prior Year TAKS Failers (grades 4-11) was not reported due to confidentiality. The attendance rate for school year 2008-09 was down .2% from the previous year at 97.2%, which surpassed the state, district or campus group. The annual dropout rate was 0% with all students either graduating the traditional way or completing their GED.  In regards to college readiness, Sundown saw decrease in Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion of 1%. and RHSP/DAP Graduates showed an increase of 27.7% to 83.3%. The school experienced increases in the area of AP/IB Results In the section of Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Sundown saw increases in percentages as well as scoring higher than the state, district, and Campus Group. For SAT/ACT testing, the school saw a increase in numbers tested to 100%, and saw an increase in the At/Above Criterion section. The mean score for both SAT and ACT increased as well. Our College-Ready graduates surpassed the State and Campus Group as well with ratings of 63% in ELA, 96% in mathematics, and 63% in both subjects.  Grade 9 saw decreases in both areas tested. In reading these decreases were in the subgroups of Hispanics, Males and Economically Disadvantaged. In Mathematics, the only decrease was in Males. Both years the campus scored higher than the averages given for the State, District and Campus Group.  Grade 10 saw an decrease in the area of Mathematics of only 1% from 98% to 97%. ELA and Mathematics maintained a score each year of >99%. Science saw an increase of 3% to 97%. No data was given for the African American subgroup. All other subgroups showed an increase. During the 2008-09 testing year my campus scored higher than or tied the averages given for the State, District and Campus Group.  Grade 11 remained the same in the area of Social Studies at 99%. Mathematics showed a decrease of 3% to 96%. Science experienced a increase in its rate from 94% to 98% and ELA experienced an increase as well going from 94% to 98%. In ELA, all subgroups showed an increase. For Science the only area to show a decrease was in Whites(2%). My school scored higher than the State, District and Campus Group averages for both years.  Section II of the report showed just how small my school is in regard to the other schools we are compared to. We had 34 graduates that school year and the campus group had over 14,000. A positive area is that our student to teacher ratio was the lowest at 8.4. Our district ratio is 9.9 and the state is 14.4. Of the 34 graduates, 21 graduated either on the recommended or DAP program. One area that stands out is even though we have 37.5% of Hispanic students, we had only 5.4% of Hispanic teachers for that year.  In the area of finances, Sundown spends much more per student. The Campus Group (By Function) amount is $6,362, Sundown’s is $16,997. |

**Part 2: Campus Group and CI Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

Prior to completing this part of the assignment, review “Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group” in the Week 2 Reading *2009 Accountability Manual.*

Directions

1. Navigate to [*http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis*](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis)
2. Select the most recent year’s report from the column on the left. Next, click on “Comparable Improvement” (left column). In the text, click on the highlighted words “Campus Group and CI Report.”
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a “Campus Group and CI Report.” Select PDF format because this is the format used on the TExES Principal Exam. Then click continue.
4. Print out the “Campus Group and CI Report.”
5. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format.
6. Summarize your “Campus Group and CI Report” findings in the workspace below.

Campus Group and CI Report Summary Workspace

|  |
| --- |
| The criteria used for this particular Campus Comparison Group was in the following order: % White, % Hispanic, % Economically Disadvantaged, % Mobility, % African American, and % LEP. The averages for these categories were as follows: 54.4% White, 41.4% Hispanic, 24.2% Economically Disadvantaged, 8.9% Mobility, 1.9% African American, and 0% LEP.  Sundown was in the 2nd quartile for Reading/ELA and 1st for the Mathematics section. Our Average Texas Growth Index (TGI) had a score of -0.06. We saw a scaled score increase from 2323 to 2353. Our estimated scaled score was set at 2361. Although my school had the highest math scores, we were not ranked very well because we did not show the growth. In the case of my school, this shows to be moot indicator.  For Reading/ELA, the 2008-09 Group Average Scale Score was 2329 and my school scored 2328. From 2008 to 2009 we had a decrease in our scaled scores of 16 points, and we fell short of our Estimated Average Scale Score, so our Average TGI was -0.06. This placed us in the 2nd Quartile for that area. In 2009, we were above the Group Average Scale Score by 8 points and in 2008 se were below by 18 points.  Analyzing the data shows slight fluctuations between years which would not necessarily indicate a decline in the quality of education but the differences in students from year to year. The data does not show a significant increase or decrease from the previous year. Slight fluctuations should be considered normal. |

**Part 3: Multi-Year History Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

Directions

1. Navigate to [*http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis*](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis).
2. On the left, click Multi-Year: Schools.
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a campus “Multi-Year History Report.”
4. Select the most current span of years in PDF format because this is the format used on the TExES Principal Exam. Then click continue.
5. Print out the “Campus Data Multi-Year History.”
6. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format.

* Look for increases and decreases in performance by subject, grade level, and subgroups. Compare **campus** results with state, district, and campus group.
* Note patterns and/or trends you see over time.

1. Summarize the patterns and/or trends noted in the data in the workspace below.

Multi-Year History Report Summary Workspace

|  |
| --- |
| All test taken showed a steady increase from 2003 to 2009 with a slight dip in 2008. This trend was consistent overall and in all subgroups. My campus has peaked at 96% in 2009. In the area of Reading/ELA , the same trend prevailed overall and in all subgroups with a slight decline in 2005. Current overall percentage is at 99% with little deviation in the subgroups. Mathematics shows a sizable increase from 2003 to 2006 with little fluctuation up until the present. The subgroups show the same results. There is no data in the writing category. Social Studies show consistently high results in all areas peaking out at 99% in all subgroups in 2009. Science showed the greatest fluctuation in results. All students tested ranged from the lowest of 60% in 2003 to 97% in 2009. All subgroups showed some fluctuation, but overall, good steady growth peaking out in 2009 at 94% Economically Disadvantaged, 98% White, 97% Hispanic, and due to privacy issues not results were given for African Americans. Sundown outpaced all comparisons to state, district, and campus groups.  Sundown shows a consistent pattern of growth in all tested subjects and all subgroups. All areas are peaking out at very close to 100%, showing very little room for additional growth.  The annual dropout rate was at 0% across the board with one exception in 2006 where it appears that one Hispanic student dropped out.  The completion rate was at 100% for 2003 and 2004, with a drop in the mid 90% range in 2006 and 2007, returning to 100% in 2008 and 2009.  Overall, Whites rated the highest, but there was only a slight dropout in the other subgroups. |

**Part 4: AEIS Comparison Chart – All Grades Tested (ELCC 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**

In the next section of the assignment, complete three charts using AEIS data: one for your selected campus; a second for a selected grade level; and a third for other campus factors.

Directions

In each of the four charts below, record the standard for performance on the AEIS base indicator. Next, measure your campus performance against the AEIS standard. See the Accountability Manual for the most current standards for each AEIS indicator.

For example, for a campus to be rated “Acceptable” according to 2009 standards, its students must score 70% on the Reading portion of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). Suppose your campus scored 65%. Then you would measure your campus against the standard by subtracting 65 (your campus score) from 70 (the Acceptable standard). There would be a difference of -5. In other words, your campus still has some work to do before it meets the standard. There are additional ways to achieve certain ratings under the Required Improvement (RI), Texas Projection Measure (TPM), and Exceptions rules that are addressed in the Accountability Manual, but for now, look strictly at the standards noted above.

For a campus to be rated exemplary, the campus must score at least 90% in all applicable areas. Suppose, however, that your campus scored 95%. Then you would measure your campus against the standard by subtracting 90% (the standard) from 95% (your campus score). The difference would be +5. In other words, your campus is exceeding the exemplary standard.

**AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Acceptable** | | **Recognized** | **Exemplary** |
| **Base Indicators** | **Standard (varies by subject):**   * **Reading:** * **Writing:** * **Social Studies:** * **Mathematics:** * **Science:** | | **Standard (same for all subjects):** | **Standard (same for all subjects):** | |
| **TAKS (use most recent results & most recent standards criteria)** | **Standard – Campus Score = Difference**  *Example: 70 – 65 = -5* | | **Standard – Campus Score = Difference**  *Example: 75 – 65 = -10* | **Standard – Campus Score = Difference**  *Example: 90 – 65 = -25* | |
| **Reading/ ELA** |  | |  |  | |
| All Students | +29 | | +24 | +9 | |
| African American | NA | | NA | NA | |
| Hispanic | +28 | | +23 | +8 | |
| White | +29 | | +24 | +9 | |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +23 | | +21 | +6 | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Writing** | |  |  |  | |
| All Students | | NA | NA | NA | |
| African American | | NA | NA | NA | |
| Hispanic | | NA | NA | NA | |
| White | | NA | NA | NA | |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | | NA | NA | NA | |

**AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested (Continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Studies** | |  |  |  |
| All Students | | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| African American | | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| White | | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | | +29 | +24 | +9 |
|  | | | | |
| **Mathematics** | |  |  |  |
| All Students | | +41 | +21 | +6 |
| African American | | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | | +43 | +33 | +8 |
| White | | +42 | +32 | +7 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | | +37 | +27 | +2 |
|  | | | | |
| **Science** |  | |  |  |
| All Students | +47 | | +22 | +7 |
| African American | NA | | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | +47 | | +22 | +7 |
| White | +48 | | +23 | +8 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +44 | | +19 | +4 |

AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level

For this portion of the assignment, select a grade level at your campus.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Acceptable** | **Recognized** | **Exemplary** |
| **Base Indicators** | **Standard (varies by subject):**  **Reading:**  **Writing:**  **Social Studies:**  **Mathematics:**  **Science:** | **Standard (same for all subjects):** | **Standard (same for all subjects):** |
| **TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)** | **Standard – Grade Level = Difference** | **Standard – Grade Level = Difference** | **Standard – Grade Level = Difference** |
| **Reading/ ELA** |  |  |  |
| All Students | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| African American | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| White | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +29 | +24 | +9 |
|  | | | |
| **Writing** |  |  |  |
| All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| African American | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | NA | NA | NA |
| White | NA | NA | NA |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |

AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Studies** |  |  |  |
| All Students | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| African American | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| White | +29 | +24 | +9 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +29 | +24 | +9 |
|  | | | |
| **Mathematics** |  |  |  |
| All Students | +41 | +21 | +6 |
| African American | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | +41 | +21 | +6 |
| White | +38 | +18 | +3 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +44 | +24 | +9 |
|  | | | |
| **Science** |  |  |  |
| All Students | +48 | +23 | +8 |
| African American | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | +49 | +24 | +9 |
| White | +47 | +22 | +7 |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +49 | +24 | +9 |

AEIS Comparison Chart: Other Factors

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Acceptable** | **Recognized** | **Exemplary** |
| **Base Indicators** | **Standard:** | **Standard:** | **Standard:** | |
| **TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | |
|  | | | | |
| ***Completion Rate (High School)*** |  |  |  | |
| All Students | +25 | +15 | +5 | |
| African American | NA | NA | NA | |
| Hispanic | +25 | +15 | +5 | |
| White | +25 | +15 | +5 | |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | +25 | +15 | +5 | |
|  |  |  |  | |
| **Base Indicators** | **Standard: 75%** | **Standard: 85%** | **Standard: 95%** | |
| **TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | |
|  | | | | |
| ***Dropout Rate (Grades 7 & 8)*** |  |  |  | |
| All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| African American | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| White | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Econ. Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
|  | | | | |
| **Base Indicators** | **Standard:** | **Standard:** | **Standard:** | |
| **TAKS (AEIS reports the previous year’s attendance rate)** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | **Standard – Campus Score = difference** | |
|  | | | | |
| **Attendance Rate** | +2.2 | +2.2 | +2.2 | |

**Part 5: Area of Strength (ELCC 2.2. k-i, s-i, iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 k-i, s-i, ii, iii)**

In part 4, you completed the AEIS Comparison Charts to record your school’s scores and compare them to the standards for each AEIS rating by computing the difference between the standard for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary in each subject, grade, and subgroup. Next, you will use the data to determine areas of strength and weakness at the campus. In a later assignment, you will use the data to build an action plan for school improvement.

**Directions**

1. Use the AEIS Comparison Charts to target one area of strength and two areas of weakness at the campus.
2. In the workspace below, briefly explain why you chose each area of strength and weakness.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identified Area of Strength** | **Why I Chose It** |
|  |  |
| 1. Social Studies and ELA | Our students scored 99% overall and in all subgroups, leaving very little room for growth. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Identified Area of Weakness** | **Why I Chose It** |
|  |  |
| 1. Mathematics-Disadvantaged students | I really don’t think this is necessarily a weakness, but it did have the lowest percentage of passing students at 92%. There is room for improvement. |
| 2. Mathematics-Whites | Again, I would not call this a glaring weakness, but the scores were not as high at 97%. There is a little room for improvement, but it is probably just one or two students. |

**E-portfolio assignment:**

**Complete “II-004 Curriculum, Measurement, and Alignment of Resources” Course-Embedded Log 1.**

Continue to complete and post Campus-Supervised reflection logs in the e-portfolio. All Course-Embedded and Campus-Supervised logs must be completed by your 11th course in the program prior to the EDLD 5398 Internship course.